

John Harwick

From: John Harwick
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:21 AM
To: Chester Stojanovic
Subject: Re: Activity in Case 1:20-cv-04448-LJL Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al Set/Reset Hearings

This is set for 2/14 at 11:00 am.

John F. Harwick, Esq.

E. Stewart Jones Hacker Murphy LLP

Office: (518)274-5820

Fax: (518)274-5875

Cell: (518)281-8150

On Feb 3, 2022, at 11:18 AM, Chester Stojanovic <admin@phoenixdatas.com> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Robert Friedman <rfriedman@sheppardmullin.com>
Date: February 1, 2022 at 8:23:27 PM EST
To: "Riera, Mark" <MRiera@jmbm.com>, Chester Stojanovic <admin@phoenixdatas.com>, Chet Stojanovich <chet@chetminingco.com>
Cc: "Cohen, Bradford" <BCohen@jmbm.com>
Subject: RE: Activity in Case 1:20-cv-04448-LJL Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al Set/Reset Hearings

From: John Harwick <jharwick@joneshacker.com>
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Riera, Mark <MRiera@jmbm.com>
Subject: Fwd: Activity in Case 1:20-cv-04448-LJL Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al Set/Reset Hearings

John F. Harwick, Esq.

E. Stewart Jones Hacker Murphy LLP

200 Harborside Drive

Suite 300

Schenectady, NY 12305

Office: (518)274-5820

Fax: (518)274-5875

Cell: (518)281-8150

www.joneshacker.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Harwick <jharwick@joneshacker.com>

Date: January 21, 2022 at 11:41:56 AM EST

To: Deanna Dudley <ddudley@joneshacker.com>

Subject: Fwd: Activity in Case 1:20-cv-04448-LJL Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al Set/Reset Hearings

DIARY

John F. Harwick, Esq.

E. Stewart Jones Hacker Murphy LLP

200 Harborside Drive

Suite 300

Schenectady, NY 12305

Office: (518)274-5820

Fax: (518)274-5875

Cell: (518)281-8150

www.joneshacker.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: [NYSD ECF Pool@nysd.uscourts.gov](mailto:NYSD_ECF_Pool@nysd.uscourts.gov)
Date: January 21, 2022 at 11:37:56 AM EST
To: CourtMail@nysd.uscourts.gov
Subject: Activity in Case 1:20-cv-04448-LJL Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al Set/Reset Hearings

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

Southern District of New York

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 1/21/2022 at 11:36 AM EST and filed on 1/21/2022

Case Name: Holmes et al v. Chet Mining Co, LLC et al
Case Number: [1:20-cv-04448-LJL](#)
Filer:
WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 11/25/2020
Document Number: No document attached

Set/Reset Hearings: Telephone Conference set for 2/14/2022 at 11:00 AM before Judge Lewis J. Liman. (va)

1:20-cv-04448-LJL Notice has been electronically mailed to:

John Frederick Harwick jharwick@joneshacker.com,
ddudley@joneshacker.com,
diversen@joneshacker.com,
djohnson@joneshacker.com,
sfebus@joneshacker.com

Benjamin Fisher Neidl bneidl@joneshacker.com

1:20-cv-04448-LJL Notice has been delivered by other means to:

Attention: This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments

the Court's decision in *United States v. Smith*, 19 F.3d 1041 (10th Cir. 1994), which held that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission.

The Court also noted that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission, and that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission.

The Court also noted that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission, and that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission.

The Court also noted that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission, and that the government's failure to disclose the existence of a material exculpatory witness to the defense constituted a material omission.